Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—I move that the Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill be taken into consideration.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—I rise to oppose this measure, and in doing so, I am anxious to make one or two observations.

Mr. P. S. Kesavan Nambudiri.—On a point of order, Sir, is it seconded?

Mr. Paul Mampilli.—I beg to second it.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—I shall make one or two observations not only in relation to this Bill but in relation to the attitude adopted by the Government. The introduction of this Bill was sought for by my Hon'ble friend in the last session and by a little carelessness or oversight on our part, the introduction of the Bill was effected and seconded and nobody wanted to oppose the measure. It was pointed out to us by the President, and I believe rightly and properly that the time for opposition is passed. The only other alternative left open to us was then to oppose the measure to its going into the Committee's stage. We accordingly opposed this measure and it was thrown out, thereby showing the intention of the members of the communities vitally affected by this measure.

Now I can very well understand the Government assuming an attitude of neutrality before they understand the real position and the real feelings of the communities affected. But once they have understood the unanimous vote of the communities affected by this measure, I ask the Government is it not their duty to assert the functions of Government. You have abrogated the functions of the Government by this attitude of neutrality, a Government which presides over a number of communities, warring communities, which have defaced the fair face of this land by these communal quarrels, a Government which has to hold the balance evenly among the communities when once they find that such changes affect the communities as seen from the unanimous voice expressed in this House—mind you, unanimous voice of protest. There is only one gentleman remaining neutral. Nobody supported this measure and I believe he is going to oppose this measure to-day. The whole community protested it in unmeasured terms. Is it not the duty of the Government to safeguard their interests? Sir, the oppression of the majority is no less serious than the oppression of the minority. I have heard it stated that the majority oppresses the minority. But the oppression of the minority against the majority is equally serious. A measure of this type, even if it is passed in this House, no other Government in this universe, leave alone the Cochin Government, will be able to put into practice. A combination of German, English, French and United States

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Governments will not be able to put into practice such a fantastic measure. A measure which cannot be translated into action is brought to this House and the Government is simply sitting there saying we are neutral. I am sorry the Diwan-President is not present to-day. Now, Sir, not only the measure is inapplicable and impossible of translating into action, but the Government goes a step further and assumes that a person, as soon as he receives Government salary, ceases to be a human being. Haven't you got your own people, your own children to look after? The mere fact that a Government Member receives money in payment does not take away from him the rights and duties of his being a Member of this House. There are questions which affect vitally as individual Members, not as Police Commissioner and Director of Public Instruction, but as Mr. I N. Menon and Mr. Nilakanta Menón and people like that who have got equal rights and privileges in this House as a Non-official Member has. Why did not the Government go a step further and say, here is a measure, each one is expected to vote as he likes and by getting the majority vote the question will be considered? I ask the Government, is it not its duty to assume this attitude? How are you going to manage this State, if I bring a Bill tomorrow here that in the case of children by the union of a Protestant and a Roman Catholic the customary law that is followed by them in considering all the issues as Roman Catholics should be done away with? Anybody who knows the power and influence of the Roman Catholic Heirarchy will know that the law will be defied, because they have got that union and the strength arising from the union which is lacking in us. Are you going to take advantage of that? I wonder. There is a limit even to the endurance of the much-abused caste Hindus. That endurance is reaching and if the Government is not careful in safeguarding the interests, what will the Government do? When by a chance majority we bring a resolution which vitally affects the religious instincts, religious interests, the social interests of these communities, such responsibilities must be considered by the Government. The Government ought to ponder over these things and if they think that the points that I have raised deserve consideration, I hope and trust that on a future occasion when such measures are brought into this House, they will receive due consideration without fear or favour and without fear of friendly criticism or favourable criticism and thereby asserting the rights, duties and responsibilities instead of hiding themselves by calling themselves neutrals. I hate the word 'neutral'. A man must have on opinion one way or other. A man without an opinion is almost akin to an animal.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Now, Sir, having said so much about the attitude of the Government I will only touch upon another point. By a simple coincidence, I honestly respect the opinion of the mover, because he believes. I will not here use harsh words against him. At least he is consistent in his advocacy by a policy. Whether you may agree with him or not is another matter. But what about his supporters? The very same supporters are against the Civil Marriage Law. You will understand that the Civil Marriage Law is by no means such a serious measure as this piece of legislation. The very people including the Professors were against this small piece of legislation, the Civil Marriage Bill. (*Hear, hear.*) Why, because the Civil Marriage Bill affects them. This does not affect them. They think they can pull down the caste Hindus a step further. That is the position. Now, why I am dealing with these things is that this sort of thing we have not been experiencing for some time. We are faced with serious difficulties in the State. So long as we are united, give the Government the moral support, then most probably the Government will be able to face the forces that are against them. If we divide or disunite or quarrel, our power is lost and the inevitable disaster will overcome this place. This piece of legislation will not be carried by this House and even if carried in this House, it will not come into force. It will not come into force without bloodshed. You may laugh. I am as bold as any one in all such matters.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—There are others bolder than you.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—You will see about that boldness. If it affects so vitally and if the Government remains neutral and get this passed, beware, we will not respect that law of Cochin Government. We are not bound either by the law of nation or by the divine law to observe these laws, except the mover, mind you. I always make the exemption. Except the mover, all the others are actuated by this single spirit, venomous spirit, and that is proved by the Civil Marriage Bill. Had they supported that also, they would have my ground under feet. I will only deal with the principle of this Bill. It has already been dealt with and the House will excuse me if I read one sentence which has already been mentioned here. "We are dealing with a customary law which is not on the statute. What is the nature of the customary law? I think customary law should be inelastic and should adapt itself to the prevailing conditions and the changing conditions at the time....." These are the three essential conditions necessary, laid down by an eminent Judge. By such a law the communities should not be affected. That is another additional point. When is it to be brought

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

into force? The learned Chief Judge of the High Court lays down this dictum. He says, "At the same time it must be borne in mind that when the law is too far in advance of public opinion it loses its sanction." He says if you change the law and if you are satisfied that the reforms that you are going to effect by such a law is far in advance of the public opinion, it loses its sanctity. I hold that this measure loses its sanctity because it is in advance of public opinion, at least of the communities concerned; and therefore, without going into the details of the miseries and troubles that will have to be faced if this measure were introduced, I have a right to oppose it.

I have to mention another point. Formerly the opposition was to send it to a Committee. When difficult points were raised, my friend said all these things could be rectified at a Committee stage. The Bill was not sent to the Committee. Now, if this Bill with all the imperfections, with all the troubles, with all the irregularities and with all the calamities, were to be brought into force, all these most absurd positions could be revealed. If this Bill is objectionable even in one aspect, and in one aspect I suppose it is, *viz.*, of getting the money's share, getting the share of the property before you become converted, how many thousand times more difficult this Bill is for the Government to enact! When, as has been pointed out by my friend, a Christian can sit and perform his mother's ceremony along with his Hindu brother, what are we coming to? This does not seem invested with the dignity of a primary school debating society. Where shall we consider this argument in this way? I, therefore, again, say, in all earnestness and with all vehemence that I can command that this Bill should be opposed irrespective of the consequences. We shall do away with this law, unless our people whom it may concern, show by some means or other that they are anxious for such a change.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—Sir, I feel extremely diffident to support this Bill on account of the threats that have been thrown on this House by the Hon'ble Member for Cheruviruthi. I take it that the Hon'ble Member himself was not very serious when he was threatening.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—You may take it as you like. I am not responsible for your statement.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—The Hon'ble Member was threatening with blood-shed. I desire to inform the Hon'ble Member that on a question of blood-shed we are not going to budge and I challenge my friend to carry out his threat on that point. This House is not going to be guided because one Member threatens with blood-shed, nor will this House fear of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

disobedience if this Bill is carried into effect. I submit it is quite beside the point and it is not an argument to say that this Bill should not be accepted by this House, because even if it is opposed, we are not going to budge. I do not want to discuss the merits of the Bill which has been pressed at length; but one important point to which I wish to draw the attention of this House is that there is no force in the argument that the communities concerned object to it. The Bill is intended for those who want to leave the community, so that the communities are not affected at all. It is only to give protection to those who leave the community, so that the community is absolutely unconcerned with this matter. That is one point which I want to bring to the notice of this House.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—Sir, I too desire to enter my emphatic protest against this Bill. I was one of those who opposed even the granting of the leave to introduce this Bill, because it appeared to me that the result of allowing this Bill to go in would be certainly disastrous, disastrous to the State, disastrous to the communities sought to be affected thereby. The title of this Bill "The Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill" is a misnomer. These disabilities obtain only and particularly among the Hindus of the State. Although it is said to be a Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill, I do not think that the followers of any other persuasion would be seriously affected by the provisions of this Bill. In a matter of this kind, in endeavouring to legislate in regard to a community, upon rights vitally affecting their social arrangements and organisations, I echo the sentiments of the Hon'ble Member for Cheruviruthi, in the hope that the Government may be pleased to allow its officers to exercise their individual right of vote. I would even go a step further and say, that in a matter which tends to disrupt society, Government Members should oppose the motion. Government is for freedom of religion. Government is carried on, on the basis that all communities should pull on in a spirit of co-operation and love. This Bill, if passed, would really lead to internal strife and quarrel among the members of a Hindu family. Mahatma Gandhi says "Religion is a matter of mind." Religion has no concern with material considerations. The object of this Bill is to give an outcaste or a man who wants to renounce his religion, proprietary rights, not over the property he acquired but over family property. A joint family exists for the purpose of all the members of that family and if any member wants to sever from it he can very well do so. But it is harmful, for the preservation of the family as a whole, to allow this outgoing member any right in the joint family property after severance. The preamble, probably, though inadvertently, makes this

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

matter clear. "Whereas it has been the policy of the State to allow freedom of religion to every one and whereas it is expedient that a person should not be deprived of any of his rights"—this sufficiently explains what I meant. There is absolutely no objection for a man to get his share of the property if the law allows it before he changes his religion. If that is not permissible the legislature cannot step in and say you may change your religion and yet retain the interest in property. That ought not to be the spirit in which the Bill intended to improve society should be introduced in this Council and accepted by the House. Clause 4 says, "So much of any law or usage now in force in Cochin as inflicts on any person forfeiture of rights of property or may be held in any way to impair or affect any rights of inheritance by reason of his renouncing" etc. So far as the Hindu law is concerned when a man becomes a convert or when he is outcasted from society the High Courts of Travancore and Madras and also our Chief Court have held that a man would not be entitled to any proprietary interest in the family. Now section 4 wants to abrogate this recognised custom and this recognised rule of law. Section 5 of the Nayar Regulation lays down that a marriage will be dissolved by the death of either party or by either party renouncing Hinduism or becoming an outcaste. That is to say, under normal conditions a Nayar male or a Nayar woman who happens to fall within the purview of this Regulation, *i. e.* who happens to contract a valid marriage would respectively be entitled to share the estate of the husband in the property of the wife and *vice versa*. Section 5 says the marriage will be dissolved by renouncing Hinduism. Section 4 of the Civil Marriage Bill wants to abrogate that rule of law. Now section 5 had been enacted after a due consideration of what the effect of that provision would be when it was enacted in this State. So a back-door attempt to negative the effect of section 5 of the Nayar Regulation, by the introduction of section 4 here cannot be accepted. If that was the view of the Government, if that was the popular feeling, section 5 would not have found a place in the Nayar Regulation. I have also referred in detail to the great danger which the Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill if enacted into law would bring upon Hindu society as a whole. I think that the Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill should be opposed by all those who opposed the Civil Marriage Bill, on a matter of principle. There is no meaning in opposing one Bill and supporting the other. The object of both these Bills is mainly to disrupt Hindu society. There is no demand at all for such legislation. That this Bill should have been introduced by a Buddhist is an irony of fate.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Buddhism is a Gospel of love, but this Bill would sow the seeds of hatred. Upon these grounds, I beg to oppose this motion.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—I am also opposing this motion. The Bill was discussed at length when a motion was made for referring it to a Select Committee and I would not have risen and spoken on this motion if it is not for making some observations upon certain statements made by the Hon'ble Member for Cheruviruthy. I don't agree with him that the Government has not adopted a proper and reasonable attitude. I also do not agree with his view that the Government ought to have asked the Government Members to exercise their own personal opinion in this matter because they are here only as the nominees of the Diwan.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—But they are also members.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—The Government had no option but to nominate Heads of Departments to whatever caste or creed they belong as members to represent the particular department.

Dr. A. R. Menon—On a point of order. In the case of the Nambudiri Bill this permission was given by the Government.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—I am speaking only my own opinion in the matter. I say Government exercised its discretion properly in asking the Government Members to remain neutral. I also do not agree with that Hon'ble Member when he says that if this Bill is passed into law there would be blood-shed. I cannot agree with him. I have no doubt that the people will obey its provisions if it is passed. My principle opposition to this Bill is this. Nobody is in a position to say who are the persons or which are the communities that want this Bill to be passed into law. The Government would have at the very outset refused permission to bring in this Bill if it had made enquiries into that matter. I think this was once done and then sanction was refused. I do not know why the Government did go back upon that decision without making any further enquiry into the matter. Since however, the Bill has been allowed to be brought into the Council, the only question is what the Hon'ble Members of this House, the majority of the members of this Council, think about its being passed into law. With regard to that one thing is clear. With one single exception all the members belonging to the Hindu community are on the one side and all the members belonging to the other communities are on the other. I put the question to them:—Is it right that they should take an active part in having this Bill passed against the will of the community to be affected by it? I say there is something behind that attitude of theirs. What they want is that the Bill should be passed into law not because it accords with the desire of the community to be affected but by something else. This is my main reason for opposing this Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. P. S. Kesavan Nambudiri.—I was perhaps the solitary exception among the Hindu section of this House not to oppose this Bill when it was introduced last time.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Myself also.

Mr. P.S. Kesavan Nambudiri.—Are you not a Buddhist? In doing so I had clearly explained my position. Even now I admit the Bill is not without some sane principles in its favour. At the same time I am also aware of the serious consequences which it might bring upon the joint Hindu families and especially upon the impartible Hindu families. It was my fervent hope that they could be removed in the Select Committee stage. Now that stage is over, we are forced either to reject it or to accept it in toto. Therefore I am constrained to oppose this Bill.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എം. ഇബ്രാഹിം.—ഉൽപതിഷ്ണുക്കളിൽ ഉൽപതിഷ്ണുവാണെന്നുള്ള വിശ്വാസത്തോടുകൂടിയാണ് ഞാൻ ഡാക്ടർ എ. ആർ. മേനവൻ അവർകളേയും ബഹുമാനിച്ചിരുന്നത്. രാജ്യത്തിന്റെയും, സമുദായങ്ങളുടെയും പുരോഗതിയ്ക്കു എത്രയും ഉപയുക്തങ്ങളായ ആശയങ്ങളെയും, ആവശ്യങ്ങളെയും സംബന്ധിച്ചുള്ള അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ പ്രസംഗങ്ങൾ കേട്ടു രസിയ്ക്കുവാൻ വേണ്ടിയും, അദ്ദേഹത്തോടൊന്നിച്ചു ഈ വക പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങളിൽ പങ്കുകൊള്ളുവാൻ വേണ്ടിയും ആശിച്ചിരുന്നവരിൽ ഒരാളാണ് ഞാൻ. എന്നാൽ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ഈ ബില്ലിനെപറ്റിയുള്ള എതിർപ്പു കേട്ടതിൽ എനിയ്ക്കുണ്ടായ അത്ഭുതത്തെക്കുറിച്ചു ഞാൻ എന്തുപറയട്ടെ! സാധാരണമായി രാഷ്ട്രീയ കാര്യങ്ങളെക്കുറിച്ചു ചിന്തിയ്ക്കുന്നവരെല്ലാം മതത്തിന്റെ പേരിൽ നടത്തുന്നതായ അക്രമങ്ങൾകൊണ്ടാണ് നമുക്ക് വാസ്തവത്തിൽ പുരോഗതിയുണ്ടാകാത്തതെന്നുള്ളതു് പരസ്യമായ ഒരു സംഗതിയാണ്. നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യത്തിനും, സാമുദായിക പുരോഗതിയ്ക്കും വേണ്ടി അശ്രാന്തപരിശ്രമം ചെയ്യുന്ന എന്റെ സ്നേഹിതനായ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർപോലും ഇത്രകണ്ടു യഥാസ്ഥിതികമായ നിലയിൽ ഒരഭിപ്രായം പറഞ്ഞു കേട്ടതിൽ എനിയ്ക്കു തീവ്രമായ വ്യസനവും അത്ഭുതവുമാണുണ്ടാകുന്നതു്. എന്തൊ അദൃഷ്ടികരമായ നിലയിൽ അദ്ദേഹം ഇതിനെപറ്റി എതിർത്തു സംസാരിച്ചുപോയി എങ്കിലും, ഉദ്ദേശശുദ്ധിയോടെ ഇതിൽ വിശ്വസിയ്ക്കുന്ന ചെറുപ്പക്കാരായ ഞങ്ങളൊടുകൂടി അദ്ദേഹവും പങ്കുകൊള്ളുമെന്നു് എനിയ്ക്കു പൂർണ്ണമായ വിശ്വാസമുണ്ടു്

പ്രധാനമായി ഇതിൽ എനിയ്ക്കു പറയുവാനുള്ളതു് നമ്മെ തിരഞ്ഞെടുത്തയയ്ക്കുന്ന നിയോജക മണ്ഡലത്തിലുള്ള വോട്ടറന്മാരെല്ലാം നൂറുക്കു നൂറുപേരും തന്നെ ഓരോ വിഷയത്തിലുള്ള മനസ്ഥിതിയോടുകൂടിയവരായിരിയ്ക്കുകയില്ല എന്നുള്ളതാണ്. നമ്മുടെ നിയോജക മണ്ഡലത്തിൽ എത്രയൊ വിഭിന്നികളുണ്ടു്. രാജ്യ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ത്തിന്റെ പുരോഗതിയ്ക്കു തടസ്ഥമായുള്ള വിധത്തിൽ അഭിപ്രായം പുറപ്പെടുവിക്കുന്ന യാഥാസ്ഥിതികന്മാരായ വോട്ടർമാരാണ് ഭൂരിപക്ഷവും. അവരുടെ അഭിപ്രായംമാത്രമാണ് ജനപ്രതിനിധികം ഈ സഭയിൽ പറയുന്നതെന്നുവച്ചാൽ നമ്മളം ഇവിടെ വന്നു പോകുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് യാതൊരു പ്രയോജനവും ഉണ്ടാകുന്നതല്ല. അവരുടെ യാഥാസ്ഥിതികാഭിപ്രായം രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ പുരോഗതിക്കു തടസ്ഥമാണെന്നു വന്നാൽ നാം ഒരിയ്ക്കലും അതിനെ mind ചെയ്യരുതു്. നാം അവരുടെ അടിമകളായി ഇവിടെ വന്നു പണിക്കായി നയിക്കുവാനല്ല വിചാരിയ്ക്കേണ്ടതു്. വാസ്തവത്തിൽ ഉന്നതങ്ങളായ ആദർശങ്ങളെ നാം സ്വീകരിക്കുകയും അവരെക്കൂടി അതിലുൾപ്പെടുത്തി പുതിയ ഭൂമിയുള്ള വരാക്കിത്തീർത്തു് നയിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു പോകുകയുമാണ് വേണ്ടതു്. അല്ലാതെ നാം അവരുടെ അടിമകളും ആശ്രിതന്മാരുമായിരുന്നുകൊണ്ടു്, അവരുടെ യാഥാസ്ഥിതികത്വത്തെ പ്രതിബിംബിക്കുന്ന ഒരു ഛായമാത്രമായി ഇവിടെ പ്രവൃത്തിക്കുന്നപക്ഷം നമുക്കു് പബ്ലിക്കു് ലൈഫിനെ വിട്ടു പോകേണ്ടതായിട്ടുതന്നെ വരും. (ഹിയർ, ഹിയർ) അതുകൊണ്ടു് അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ യാഥാസ്ഥിതികത്വത്തെ ഇനിയെങ്കിലും പിൻവലിയ്ക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അപേക്ഷയോടുകൂടി ഞാൻ വിരമിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

Mr. P. Raman Menon.—Sir, I oppose this measure. I am told that there was a previous attempt to introduce a similar bill and that the Government refused permission to introduce it. There was a full discussion of the merits of this Bill in the last session, and I do not want to go into it again. But just to make the Hon'ble Members realise the position of the society if this Bill is passed, I shall take an illustration. Let us take a Nambudiri illom, an impartible Nambudiri illom, the karanavan of which becomes a convert. What is the position if this Bill becomes law? He will be entitled to exercise all the rights of karanavanship. He will be entitled if that illam owns a Devaswam to remain an Uralan of that temple, and to enter it at his sweet will and pleasure. None of his rights which existed previous to his conversion can be taken away. That means he will be entitled to manage that Devaswam. He will be entitled to enter the temple and to perform worship there in his own way whether he is a Muhammadan, Hindu or Christian. What anomaly are we being driven to? I do not know if the Hon'ble mover has realised what he is doing. Can any joint Hindu family exist under these conditions, the conditions laid down by this Bill? A Hindu joint family consisting of members belonging to different religions!!!

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. M. Ibrahim.—Why should they exist at all? We want them, because they are inseparably connected with our religious principles and faith.

Mr. P. Raman Menon.—Who wants this Bill to become law? That is the one question that I asked last time and that is the question I am putting today also. Does the Hindu community require it? So far as I know, they don't want it. They hate it. The very idea of this Bill they hate. Not only the caste Hindus, Hindus of all denominations do not want it. Even the community to which the Hon'ble mover belongs, does not want it. They hate it, so far as my enquiry goes Which then is the community that is now after it? The only communities that can be really interested in this matter, are the proselytising communities as the Bill will help conversion. It is to their interest to support it. That is the only reason that I can find why some of the Hon'ble Members are backing up the Hon'ble Mover.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—No.

Mr. P. Raman Menon.—Let the cat come out of the bag.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—I stand on my own legs.

Mr. P. Raman Menon.—You say that you are standing on yours legs. But some other Hon'ble Members are backing you up for different reasons. The cat was let out of the bag, when the question came about the Civil Marriage Bill. They are not after noble ideals. What is the noble ideal that they want to establish by this Bill? They want to see the ideal of a joint Hindu family destroyed completely. That is the only thing they are trying to achieve by this Bill. Under these circumstances I strongly oppose this motion.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—I was waiting with some curiosity to see that cat which the Hon'ble Member for Trippunittura was letting out of his bag. Instead of a cat I saw a barking dog jumping. Last time when this Bill came up for discussion I had no chance of taking part in it being absent, and this time also being late I had absolutely no intention of taking part in it. But the remarks just made by the Hon'ble Member that there are certain interested persons backing up the Member for South Ezhuvans for reasons of their own, induced me to say a word regarding this motion. I am really afraid to hear that if this Bill is passed volcanoes will be bursting in Cochin State, that there will be blood-shed throughout the small area of this very small State in the Southern corner of the Indian Empire. While as far back as 1857 a similar Bill was passed in British India, I do not know what was the consternation that was roused in the minds of the British people. And on account of that

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Bill volcanoes did not burst there. There was no blood shed. If blood-shed there was, it was due to other reasons, and due to similar reasons there was blood-shed in several parts of India.

Now this Bill is based on principle. I do not know whether the Hon'ble Member for South Ezhuvas belongs to a proselytising community. I do not know what the Hon'ble Member for Trippunittura meant when he said proselytising community. I have not come across, in my small knowledge of history, about the existence of any proselytising community. Each religion has taught its adherents certain principles and it is bound to inculcate among others whatever one believes. Now if the Hindu community, or if the Caste-Hindu community strongly opposes this Bill, it is the mere desire that their own religion should thrive and that it should be immune from attacks from others. That is also the reason which induced others to proselytise. So that let us not throw dirt upon each other. Each one has his pocket full of these things. We are not a proselytising community. What is the Sudhi movement? What does it stand for? Is it not proselytisation? So, we shall not talk such things in Cochin also. In Travancore—in Shertala—there was, if my learned friend has not come to know of it.

Now, Sir, if there is a principle in this Bill which must get the support of civilised persons, this House must support this Bill. But if there is no principle involved, the Bill must be thrown out. Now what is the principle in the Bill? That every man must be free to chose his own religion for himself.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—That is not the principle.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—If that is not the principle I am mistaken. Freedom of conscience is at the very root of this Bill. I know several persons will speak. Mammon too will speak philosophy outside. I hope the Hon'ble Member for Trippunittura is not one such. If we can support freedom of conscience, then I say that this Bill must get the support of this House. It is not very difficult to bring in provisions to prevent disruption of Hindu families. It is not difficult to bring in provisions which will safeguard the rights which the family has while a member of the family has no right therein. That stands on quite a different footing. But if the Member in his own capacity has any right, then it is too hard that he should lose whatever rights he has, because he wants to exercise the freedom of his conscience. That is the only thing involved in this Bill. There is no proselytisation. There is only freedom of conscience.

Now, Sir, it is a fact known to history that nearly 20 centuries ago when there was no Caste Disabilities Removal Act in

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

this State ever so many persons came to this State. A large number of Christians that you find in Cochin did not come from Syria or from any other part of the Globe. They are Cochinites. Was there blood-shed? There was tolerance during those days. Intolerance had crept in by and by. If a man wants to choose his own religion as adherents of atheism do it. Why do you prevent them? By the very act of renouncing that religion or adopting another religion why should one who has certain rights lose them, though temporal rights? I am not afraid of blood-shed. If the Cochin Government is in danger of a blood-shed I suppose the Commissioner of Police will be able to supply any number of Policemen. Do you who speak of freedom, who speak of liberty, who speak of salvation, who speak of swaraj, for the sons of India, want your sons and daughters to exercise freedom of conscience? If you want it let them have this freedom, and if you don't want it let them not have it. I beg to support this Bill.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Sir, I beg to support this Bill. I also was one of those who were extremely surprised to see the attitude taken by the Hon'ble Member for Cheruviruthi. In fact I was taken aback. The Hon'ble Member, who on all ordinary occasions is full of progressive ideas, has had the unkindness to take up a most regressive attitude in this matter. I do not say any thing about his motives. As a matter of fact I found him very much agitated and impatient; and by way of preventing anybody from speaking in support of the Bill, he has in anticipation trumped up charges against very many persons, including in his list Vakils, Professors and such other people. I am not here for any hostile campaign or any aggressive policy or to give threats of blood-shed and the like. Much eloquence has been wasted, I think, and much of vain and futile threat indulged in; phantoms and fears have been conjured up and several unkind insinuations made. Well, let them pass. What I would say at the very outset is this: in the case of those who opposed this bill there is a certain amount of inconsistency when they say that this Bill as it stands now cannot be amended, and that, therefore, it ought to be ended. I ask a simple question: 'who was responsible for not amending the Bill'? There was a stage in the discussion on this Bill when the way for amending it was quite clear. At that stage many Members wanted that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, because many defects were pointed out in the Bill. And some of these defects were real, I admit. But these defects could have been very well removed in the Select Committee. But that door was closed and the Bill was not allowed to go to the Select Committee stage. And now they, the very same persons who prevented the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Bill from going into the Select Committee, come and say—'Now look here, it is an impossible position. The Bill must either be passed as it stands, or rejected as it stands'. Well. The question is who is responsible for this predicament? Surely, it is people who closed the door against any Select Committee stage. In the Select Committee the necessary alterations could have been made. In fact, as I said then, the only point about which according to me, the Bill is particular, is this, that anybody here in Cochin renouncing a religion on account of his conviction or accepting a religion on account of his conscience, should not be penalised so far as property rights are concerned. He should still be allowed to have his claim on the property of his ancestors.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—Is that what is meant by section 3?

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Section 3 could be changed, I say. I admitted that there were certain defects in the Bill; and we said in so many words that the defects could be removed. Even now I understand, if all of us sincerely care to remove these defects, it is not impossible to move an amendment. If they want that the Bill should be modified in such a way as to make it acceptable, there is still a way open to them according to the rules.

Now therefore, the only thing that the Bill wants is this, that a man should not be punished for obeying his conscience. Is there anything so objectionable, so unreasonable, so malicious so revolutionary in this simple principle, that a man should be allowed freedom of conscience? Let him renounce a religion. Let him accept another religion. Why should we penalise his action? The Hon'ble Member for Trichur has referred Mahatma Gandhi who said that religion was a matter of the mind and such other things. I perfectly agree with him. All such arguments go to show that there should not be any impediment put in the way of a man who is desirous of changing his religion and accepting another. If, according to Mahatma Gandhi, freedom of religion is to be given; and if you put impediments to change of religion, can you say with sincerety, can you say with your hands on your breast, that you are giving freedom of religion here? To inculcate love and cordiality as between communities, would it not be better to give this freedom to the individual? Some of the Hon'ble Members spoke of communities being affected. I fail to see how any community is affected in this matter. It is essentially a question of individual freedom.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—What about the Civil Marriage Bill?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—We are not here speaking about Civil Marriage Bill (*Hear, hear*). Well, if the Members want to speak on Civil Marriage, we shall do so when it comes before this House. Why should they try to confuse issues by bringing the Civil Marriage Bill and such other things which are not pertinent to the present subject? The most I would say is that the Civil Marriage Bill is not necessary for me. (*Laughter*), (*Order, order*). I don't want to have a civil marriage for me.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—You are already married? (*Laughter*).

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Therefore, to confuse the issues between the Civil Marriage and the freedom of conscience is quite uncharitable, I say, on the part of these Hon'ble Members. The worst they could say by referring to the Civil Marriage question would be, not that the present argument of freedom of conscience is wrong, but that those who opposed the Civil Marriage would be unreasonable. (*Hear, hear*). Because they are unreasonable, does it mean that the principle underlying this Bill is unreasonable? (*Hear, hear*). Of course, they are free to accuse me as quite unreasonable in the attitude I may take on any other matter. But let them say whether in the matter underlying this Bill they could point out any unreasonableness. The only purpose of the Bill, once again I repeat, is to give freedom of conscience to all men, a principle which has been accepted by the whole world in general, a principle which is prevalent in British India, without causing any heart-burning, without causing any bloodshed, without causing any of those impossible positions which the imaginary power of the Hon'ble Member for Cheruviruthi has depicted before this House. We don't want that a man, who changes his religion, should be entitled to any rights which he originally had not in his ancestral property; nor do we say that he should be entitled to his former religious and social rights. The only thing we want is that he should not be compelled to forfeit his share in the ancestral property, the share which he possesses not as a Hindu or as a Christian, but as a man. He is born in this world and because he is born he must eat and drink. He must have some means of livelihood and it is this right of livelihood that he claims. It is not a matter that depends on religion. The Hon'ble Member for Trichur spoke of Marriage rights. I admit I am not a lawyer to speak on legal matters, as the Hon'ble Member for Trichur; but still it appears to me that the marriage rights are acquired rights *on account of the marriage*, and that naturally, therefore, these rights would be lost when the marriage is cancelled. On the contrary, the rights of which I speak are rights which are born with a man and they would cease only when he dies. Therefore, I say there could

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

be no analogy at all between the marriage rights and property rights acquired therefrom, on the one side, and, on the other, property rights which a man inherits or obtains on account of having been born a man. These are his birthrights. He must live. Because he changes his religion, we should not strave him. Even those who are cut-throats, who are murderers, even those who are deported—even they are not refused this right to property. Is change of religion such a heinous crime as to deserve a more severe punishment, a more drastic punishment, than murder, than such other big crimes as are so obnoxious, so heinous in the eyes of all civilised people ? Therefore, once again I appeal to the Hon'ble Members.—Let us keep clear of all passion; let us consider the thing quite calmly and dispassionately on the matter of principle, on the matter of fairness. Well, what is the claim? What is demanded is only freedom of conscience to an individual and what is wanted is that he should not be penalised for doing according to his conscience. If the House is for that, alright. Otherwise I have no complaint against the Hon'ble Members who opposed the Bill, because it is only *natural for them* to oppose it.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.—ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിന്റെ ചുമതലയെപറ്റി ചിലമെമ്പർമാർ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് ഈ കാര്യത്തിൽ നിഷ്പക്ഷനിലയെടുക്കാൻ പാടില്ലാത്തതായിരുന്നുവത്രെ. അതുദ്യോഗസ്ഥപക്ഷത്തുനിന്നു് ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ള വാദം വരുന്നതു കഷ്ടമാണു്. ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് നിഷ്പക്ഷനില എടുത്തതു് വളരെ ന്യായമായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഇപ്പോൾ പരിഷ്കാര കാര്യങ്ങളിൽ പരിഷ്കൃത ഗവമ്മെണ്ടുകൾ നിഷ്പക്ഷനില എടുക്കയല്ല ചെയ്യുന്നതു്. പരിഷ്കാരങ്ങളെ നടപ്പിലാക്കുവാൻ നേതൃത്വം എടുക്കയാണു് ചെയ്യുന്നതു്. കെമാൽ പാഷയുടേയും മറ്റും ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു ചെയ്യുന്നതു് അങ്ങനെയാണു്? ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥപക്ഷത്തെ മെമ്പർമാർക്കു് അധികാരത്തോടെ യുക്തംപോലെ വോട്ടു് ചെയ്യുവാൻ ഈ കാര്യത്തിൽ അനുവാദം കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിയിരുന്നു എന്നു് ഒരു മെമ്പർ വാദിയ്ക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. അങ്ങേപ്പുറത്തു ഇരിക്കുന്നതു് പ്രായേണ എല്ലാവരും ഈ ബില്ലിനു് എതിരു കാണിക്കുന്ന ജാതിക്കാരാണു്. അവർക്കു് യുക്തംപോലെ വോട്ടു ചെയ്യാൻ അനുവാദം കൊടുത്താലുള്ള ഫലം ആ സ്ഥിതിക്കു് ഉപകരിയ്ക്കാൻ പ്രയാസമില്ല.

ഞാൻ ഈ ബില്ലു കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ളതു് ഹിന്തുക്കളേയും മറ്റു മതക്കാരേയും തമ്മിൽ വഴക്കടിപ്പിയ്ക്കാനല്ല. ഇവിടെ ഹിന്തു മെമ്പരും ക്രിസ്ത്യൻ മെമ്പർ തമ്മിലും ഇതു സംബന്ധിച്ചു് വെറുപ്പു പ്രകടിപ്പിച്ചു കാണാൻ ഇടയായതിൽ ഞാൻ വ്യസനിക്കുന്നു.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ക്കുന്നു. ഒരു അകന്ന ഭാവിയിലെങ്കിലും ഒരു ഇന്ത്യൻ നേഷൻ ഉണ്ടാകണമെന്നു് ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നവരിൽ ഒരുത്തനാണു് ഞാൻ. ഇന്ത്യക്കാർ ഒരു നേഷനായി തീരണമെങ്കിൽ ഈ ബില്ലിനെ എതിർക്കുന്നവർ അതിനു് പറയുന്ന കാരണങ്ങൾ പറയത്തക്ക മനസ്ഥിതി ഇന്ത്യക്കാർക്കു് ഇല്ലാതാകണം. ഒടുക്കളക്കുത്തും അമ്പലത്തിനകത്തും എല്ലാ ജാതിക്കാരും കടക്കുന്നതിനെപറ്റി തുപ്പുണിത്തുറമെമ്പർ വലിയ ഭയം പ്രദർശിപ്പിയ്ക്കുയുണ്ടായി. ആ മാതിരി മനസ്ഥിതി നമ്മുടെ ഇടയിൽനിന്നു മാറാതെ നമ്മൾ ഒരു ഐകൃമുള്ള ജനത, നേഷൻ ആയിത്തീരുകയില്ല. നമ്മുടെ മത നിർബ്ബന്ധങ്ങളും ജാതി വ്യത്യാസങ്ങളും പോകാതെ നമുക്കു രക്ഷയില്ല. അതു രണ്ടും കളയാൻ ഒരു വിധത്തിൽ സഹായിക്കുന്ന ഒരു നിയമമാണു് എന്റെ ബില്ലു്. ക്രിസ്ത്യാനികൾ, മുസ്ലീമിങ്ങൾ, ഈഴവർ, നായന്മാർ, ബ്രാഹ്മണർ എന്നൊക്കെ പറയുന്നവരെല്ലാം മനുഷ്യർ മാത്രമാണു്. അവരുടെ ക്രിസ്ത്യാനിത്വമോ അവരുടെ മനുഷ്യത്വമാണു് പ്രധാനമായിട്ടുള്ളതു്. മനുഷ്യത്വം എല്ലാവരിലും തുല്യം. അതിൽ വ്യത്യാസമില്ല. ഞാൻ ഈ പറയുന്നതിനെ നിങ്ങളിൽ അധികപേരും സമ്മതിയ്ക്കയില്ലെന്നു് എനിയ്ക്കറിയാം. നിങ്ങൾ എത്രയോ കാതം പുറകിൽ കിടക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടാണു് അതു സമ്മതിക്കാത്തതു്. നിങ്ങൾ എന്റെ ബില്ലിനെ എതിർക്കുന്നതിൽ കാണിയ്ക്കുന്ന സങ്കുചിതമനസ്കതയും അബദ്ധവും ഇപ്പോൾ അറിയുകയില്ല. ഭാവി തലമുറകൾ ഇന്നത്തെ പ്രൊസീഡിംഗ്സ് വായിയ്ക്കുമ്പോൾ അവർ നിങ്ങളെ ശപിക്കാതിരിക്കയില്ല. ഇപ്പോൾ ഇവിടെ വാസ്തവത്തിൽ ആരെല്ലാം ഉൽപതിഷ്ണുക്കളും വിശാലഹൃദയരുമായിരുന്നു എന്നും ആരെല്ലാം യാഥാസ്ഥിതികരും ഇടുങ്ങിയ മനസ്ഥിതിക്കാരുമായിരുന്നു എന്നും അന്നു് അവർ വിധിക്കും. നിങ്ങളുടെ നിയമ ചെപ്പടികൾ കൊണ്ടൊന്നും എന്റെ വാദത്തെ എതിർക്കുവാൻ സാധിക്കയില്ല. ഞാൻ പരമാർത്ഥമാണു പറയുന്നതു്. സമുദായങ്ങളെല്ലാം ഒന്നിച്ചു ചേരുവാൻ തക്ക മനസ്ഥിതി ജനങ്ങൾക്കുണ്ടാക്കണം. അതുണ്ടായാൽ മാത്രമേ കമ്യൂണലിസം രാജ്യത്തു നിന്നു പോകയുള്ളു. കമ്യൂണൽ റീസ് ഉള്ള കാലം വരെ കമ്യൂണലിസവും നില്ക്കും. ഇന്നാവിടെ കാണിച്ച മാതിരി സമുദായ മനസ്ഥിതി പണ്ഡിതന്മാരും പ്രൊഫസർമാരും വക്കീലന്മാരും വച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരുന്നാൽ നമ്മുടെ സാധാരണ ജനങ്ങൾ അതു വിടാത്തതിൽ അത്ഭുതമെന്താണു്? ഈ മനസ്ഥിതി പോകണമെങ്കിൽ സമുദായങ്ങൾ തമ്മിൽ കലരാനും സഹവസിക്കാനും അകന്ന ഭാവിയിലെങ്കിലും ഒന്നിക്കാനും ഇട വരണം. അങ്ങിനെ ഇട വരുന്നതിനുള്ള പ്രതിബന്ധങ്ങൾ ഓരോന്നായി അറക്കണം. അതിലേക്കു് ആവശ്യമായ ഒരു നിയമമാണു് തയ്യാറാക്കുവാനാണു് ഞാൻ ബില്ലു കൊണ്ടു് നിങ്ങളോടു് ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നതു്.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

കത്തോലിക്കാ സമുദായത്തിനു് ഇഷ്ടമില്ലാത്ത നിയമം പാസ്സാക്കയാണെങ്കിൽ കത്തോലിക്കർ ഇവിടെ ഇളക്കി മറിക്കുമെന്നും അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് അങ്ങിനെയുള്ള നിയമം പാസ്സാക്കാറില്ലെന്നും ഒരു മെംബർ പറഞ്ഞു. ഇതു വെറും ക്ഷോഭം കൊണ്ടു പറഞ്ഞതായെ കരുതാനുള്ളു. അല്ലാതെ അതിൽ കാര്യമൊട്ടും ഇല്ല. കത്തോലിക്കു സമുദായത്തിലെ ഭ്രൂരിപക്ഷം പേരും ശക്തിയായി എതിത്തു കൃസ്ത്യൻ സിവിൽ വിവാഹ റെഗുലേഷൻ ഈ നിയമസഭ ഉണ്ടാകും മുമ്പു തന്നെ ഇവിടത്തെ ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് പാസ്സാക്കീട്ടുള്ളതു് ആ മെംബർ ഓർക്കാഞ്ഞതു എന്തുകൊണ്ടാണെന്നറിയുന്നില്ല. ആ നിയമം പാസ്സാക്കിയപ്പോൾ കത്തോലിക്കർ ഒരു ഇളക്കി മറിക്കലും നടത്തിയില്ല. ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് ആവശ്യമായ നല്ല നിയമങ്ങൾ പാസ്സാക്കിയാൽ അതു എതിർക്കുവാൻ ആരും ഉണ്ടാകയില്ല.

ഈ ബില്ലു് നിയമമായാൽ അതിനെ അനുസരിക്കയില്ലെന്നു ഒരു മെംബർ ഭീഷണി പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. ഈ പെർമിസ്സീവ് (Permissive) നിയമം അട്ടേഹത്തിനും കൂട്ടുകാർക്കും എങ്ങിനെ അനുസരിക്കാതിരിക്കാൻ സാധിക്കുമെന്നു് എനിക്കു മനസ്സിലാകുന്നില്ല. ഇതു ആവശ്യമുള്ളവർക്കു് ഉപയോഗപ്പെടുത്താമെന്നല്ലാതെ എല്ലാവരും അനുസരിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യം നോക്കിട്ടുന്നൊരു നിയമമല്ലല്ലൊ.

ഈ നിയമം സമുദായത്തിൽ ഛിദ്രമുണ്ടാക്കുമെന്നാണു് ഒരു മെംബരുടെ ആക്ഷേപം. ജനങ്ങളെ കാര്യം പറഞ്ഞു മനസ്സിലാക്കാൻ ശ്രമിക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അവർ ക്രമേണ ഈ വക പരിഷ്കാരങ്ങൾക്കു് അനുകൂലികളായിത്തീരും. ഛിദ്രവും ബഹളവും ആദ്യത്തെ ക്ഷോഭത്തിനുണ്ടാകുന്നതാണു്. അതു വേഗം ശമിച്ചുകൊള്ളും. ഈഴവസമുദായത്തിൽ ഈ മാതിരി പരിഷ്കാരങ്ങൾക്കു ക്ഷോഭം ഉണ്ടാകാത്ത സ്ഥിതി കുറെ വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അതു പ്രചരണവേലകൊണ്ടു വന്നതാണു്. ഈയിടെ ചേന്നമംഗലത്തു ഒരു ഈഴവനും കൃസ്ത്യൻസ്ത്രീയും തമ്മിൽ വിവാഹം നടന്നു. പള്ളുരുത്തിയിൽ ഒരു ഈഴവനും പുലയസ്ത്രീയും തമ്മിലും ഒരു ഈഴവനും നായർസ്ത്രീയും തമ്മിലും ഒരു ഈഴവനും കൃസ്ത്യൻ സ്ത്രീയും തമ്മിലും വിവാഹങ്ങൾ നടന്നിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഈ വിവാഹങ്ങൾ കൊണ്ടു ഒരു ക്ഷോഭവും ഈഴവരുടെ ഇടയിൽ ഉണ്ടായിട്ടില്ല. ഈ സ്ഥിതി നിങ്ങളുടെ സമുദായങ്ങളിലും വരുത്തുവാൻ നിങ്ങൾ ശ്രമിയ്ക്കണം. ഈഴവരുടെ ഇടയിൽ സാധ്യമായതു നിങ്ങളുടെ ഇടയിൽ സാധ്യമാകാതെ വരുകയില്ല.

മതം മനസ്സിന്റെ കാര്യമാണെന്നു മഹാത്മാഗാന്ധി പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നും മതത്തെ ഭൌതിക കാര്യങ്ങളിൽ സംബന്ധിപ്പി

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ക്കരുതെന്നും പറഞ്ഞു തുടിവപേരുർ മെംബർ എന്റെ ബി ല്ലിനെ എതുക്കയുണ്ടായി. മതം മനസ്സിന്റെ കായ്മയതുകൊ ണ്ടു മതത്തിനെ മനസ്സിന്റെ കായ്മയായി തന്നെ വെയ്ക്കണമെന്നാ ണു് ഞാനും പറയുന്നതു. മനസ്സിന്റെ കായ്മയ മതം മാറുന്നതു കൊണ്ടു് സമാവകാശം മുതലായ ഭൌതികാവകാശങ്ങൾ എ ന്തിനു് നഷ്ടപ്പെടണം എന്നാണു് ഞാൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നതു. വാ സ്തവത്തിൽ തുടിവപേരുർ മെംബർ എന്നിയ്ക്കു അനുകൂലമായ ഒരു വാദ്യയാണ പറഞ്ഞതു.

സമുദായത്തിന്റെ അഭിപ്രായത്തിനു എതിരായി സാമുദാ യിക നിയമനിർമ്മാണം പാടില്ലെന്നു് ഒരു മെംബർ വലിയ തത്വം പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. ഇതു ഇപ്പോൾ പൊളിഞ്ഞ തത്വമാണു്. നി യമനിർമ്മാണം എപ്പോഴും സമുദായത്തിന്റെ അഭിപ്രായത്തിലും ഒരു പടി കടന്നതായിരിക്കണം. നിയമം കൊണ്ടു സമുദായത്തെ മുന്നോട്ടു പിടിച്ചു വലിച്ചുകൊണ്ടുപോകയാണു് വേണ്ടതു്. സമുദായത്തിന്റെ പുറകിൽ നിന്നു് ആവശ്യത്തിനു് മ തിയാകാത്ത നിയമം ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്ന കാലം കഴിഞ്ഞുപോയി. സമു ദായത്തിന്റെ പുറകെ നിയമനിർമ്മാണമല്ല നിയമനിർമ്മാണ ത്തിന്റെ പുറകെ സമുദായമാണു് പോകേണ്ടതു.

ഈ ബില്ലിനെ ക്രിസ്ത്യൻ മെംബർമാർ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നതു മത പ്രചരിവർത്തനത്തിനു് ഇതു സഹായമാകുമെന്നുള്ളതു കൊണ്ടാണെ ന്നു ചിലർ പറയുന്നുണ്ടു്. അതു നേരായിരിക്കും. എന്തു കൊണ്ടു് അതിൽ ഹിന്ദുക്കൾ ഭയപ്പെടുന്നു? ക്രിസ്ത്യാനികൾ ഹിന്ദുക്കളെ ക്രി സ്ത്യാനികളാക്കുന്നതു പോലെ ഹിന്ദുക്കൾക്കു ക്രിസ്ത്യാനികളെയും ഹിന്ദുക്കളാക്കിക്കൂടെ? ഈയിടെ ചേന്നമംഗലത്തു ഒരു ക്രിസ്ത്യാ നിസ്ത്രീയെ ഈഴവസമുദായത്തിലേക്കു എടുക്കയുണ്ടായി.

മിസ്റ്റർ ജോജ്ജു് ചക്യാമുറി.—എങ്ങിനെ എടുത്തു എന്നാണു പറയുന്നതു?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.—ചേർത്തു എങ്ങിനെയൊ—അങ്ങി നെ ആയി. മാമൂദീസാ വെള്ളം തളിയ്ക്കുമ്പോൾ എങ്ങിനെ ക്രി സ്ത്യാനിയാകുന്നു? അങ്ങിനെചെയ്താൽ ക്രിസ്ത്യാനിയായി എന്നു ക്രി സ്ത്യാനികൾ സമ്മതിയ്ക്കുന്നു. അതുപോലെ ക്രിസ്ത്യാനിയെ ഈഴ വനാക്കിയതു ഈഴവസമുദായം സമ്മതിച്ചാൽ അയാൾഈഴവനാ കും.ഇതെല്ലാം കുറെക്കാലത്തെനടപടികൊണ്ടുശരിപ്പെട്ടുകൊള്ളും. ഹിന്ദുക്കൾക്കു് അവരുടെ സമുദായത്തിൽ ആളുകളെകൂട്ടണമെ ങ്കിൽ അവർ മറുള്ളവരെയും തങ്ങളിൽചേർക്കാൻ ഒരുങ്ങണം.

മതങ്ങളിൽനിന്നു ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഇഷ്ടംപോലെ മാറാനുള്ള സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യംവേണം. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഒരു അവകാശക്കുഴപ്പം വരരു

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

തു്. ഈ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യമുണ്ടെയാൽ മതങ്ങളിൽ നല്ലതു ജയിയ്ക്കും. അങ്ങനെയായാൽ നമുക്കു നഷ്ടമെന്തു്? മതങ്ങൾക്കുവേണ്ടിയല്ല മനുഷ്യർ; മനുഷ്യർക്കുവേണ്ടിയാണു് മതങ്ങൾ. അതുകൊണ്ടു മനുഷ്യർക്കു വേണ്ടാത്ത മതങ്ങൾ പോയാൽ ആരും ഖേദിക്കേണ്ടതില്ല. മതാചാരാദികൾ രക്ഷിയ്ക്കുവാൻവേണ്ടി മനുഷ്യരുടെ അഭിവൃദ്ധിയെ ഹോമിയ്ക്കുന്നതു അബദ്ധമാണു". വാസ്തവത്തിൽ മതങ്ങളെല്ലാം നശിച്ചാലെ ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഗുണമുള്ളു.

കത്തോലിക്കർ എന്റെ സിവിൽ വിവാഹബില്ലിനെ എതിർത്തതിനെ അവർ ഈ ബില്ലിനെ അനുകൂലിയ്ക്കുന്നതു ആത്മാർത്ഥതകൊണ്ടല്ലെന്നു തെളിയിക്കുവാൻ ആരൊ ഇവിടെ എടുത്തുപറയുകയുണ്ടായി. ക്രിസ്ത്യാനികൾ ഈ ബില്ലിനെ താങ്ങുന്നതു ആത്മാർത്ഥമായിട്ടല്ലായിരിക്കാം. അതുകൊണ്ടു മറ്റുള്ളവർ ഇതിനെ എതിർക്കണമെന്നുണ്ടോ? ഇതിന്റെ തത്വം നല്ലതാണോ എന്നു നോക്കാനുള്ളു. നല്ലതാണെങ്കിൽഇതിനെഅനുകൂലിക്കണം. കത്തോലിക്കർ എന്റെ സിവിൽവിവാഹബില്ലിനെ ഇന്നു എതിർത്താൽ അന്നു അവരോടു് "Ye, hypocrites" എന്നു ബൈബിൾ ഉദ്ധരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു അവരോടു് അവരുടെപ്രവൃത്തി ശരിയൊ എന്നു നമുക്കു ചോദിക്കാമല്ലൊ. അങ്ങനെചെയ്യാൻ നോക്കാതെ, എന്റെ ബില്ലിനെ എതിർത്താൽ കത്തോലിക്കരെല്ല എന്റെ ബില്ലിനെ തോല്പിക്കുന്നതു" എന്നു ഇവിടെ ചിലരോടു പറയേണ്ടിവന്നിരിക്കുന്നു.

ബില്ലിനു എതിരായി പുറപ്പെടുവിച്ച പ്രധാന ആക്ഷേപങ്ങൾക്കെല്ലാം സമാധാനംപറഞ്ഞുകഴിഞ്ഞു എന്നാണു് എന്റെ വിശ്വാസം. ഏതായാലും ഈ ബില്ലു് പിൻവലിക്കുവാൻ ഞാൻ അനുവാദം ചോദിയ്ക്കുന്നു.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—I oppose the motion for withdrawing.

Question put:—*Whether the member has the leave of the House to withdraw the Bill*

Motion negatived.

Question put:—*Whether the bill be taken up for consideration.*

Motion negatived

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—A poll, Sir-

The House divided—Ayes 10 and Noes 16.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Ayes.	*Noes.*
1. Mr. K. Ayyappan	1. Dr. A. G. Menon
2. ,, C. Barton Wright	2. Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar
3. ,, George Chakyamuri	3. ,, C. N. Ittiravi Nambudiri
4. ,, K. M. Ibrahim	4. ,, P. S. Kesavan Nambudiri
5. ,, Joseph Pettah	5. ,, M. Krishna Menon
6. ,, A. I. Mani	6. ,, P. Krishna Menon
7. ,, K. Mohamed Seethi	7. ,, T. K. Nayar
8. ,, C. A. Ouseph	8. ,, P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan
9. Mrs. Swaris	9. ,, Popatlal Goverdhan Lalan
10. Mr. K. P. Vallon	10. ,, T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar
	11. ,, M. K. Raman
	12. ,, P. Raman Menon
	13. Dr. A. R. Menon
	14. Mr. A. Sankara Menon
	15. Dr. K. Sankara Menon
	16. Mr. A. Sankara Poduval

Deputy President.—10 for and 16 against.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—Neutrals, Sir.

Deputy President.—The Government Members are not taking part in voting.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—Is there a position of not taking part in debate ?

Deputy President.—They have not expressed their opinion.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—With due respect to that position, Sir, the present Legislative Council Regulation does not admit that position. There are only three positions for a Member of this Council. There is no position for the Government Members here apart from the Members of the Council.

Deputy President.—If you want, you may call them as neutrals.

Neutrals—10.

1 Mr. K. Achyuta Menon
2 ,, V. K. Aravindaksha Menon
3 ,, U. Kandar Menon
4 ,, C. J. Mathew
5 ,, I. N. Menon
6 ,, P. Nilakanta Menon
7 Dr. D. Raghavendra Rao
8 Rama Varmha Tampuran
9 Mr. P. V. Raphael
10 ,, P. V. Subramania Ayyar

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—May I know what the fate of my Bill will be ?

Deputy President.—Your Bill is lost now. But after one year you may bring in the same Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly